

The peace for which we fight



TOWARD NEW HORIZONS: No. 3

So that citizens of the United States may be familiar with differing points of view regarding the United Nations and the post-war world, the Office of War Information will occasionally publish statements and speeches by men and women who have no connection with the Government of the United States.

Here are addresses by Madame Chiang Kai-shek, the Honorable Walter Nash, Governor Harold E. Stassen, Raymond Gram Swing, Eric A. Johnston, former Senator George W. Norris, and Wendell L. Willkie which are relevant because of the light they throw on thinking about the world that lies beyond the war. Publication of these speeches by the Office of War Information carries no implication that they represent the official policy of the Government.

ELMER DAVIS, *Director*

Office of War Information, Washington, D. C.

"Now and then a civilian gives me a lift; buys me a drink. When I thank them, they usually reply, 'Well, it's the least we can do for you fellows in the service.' I don't care about the lifts, about the drinks. Not much, certainly. What I do care about is that these civilians try to plan a world which discourages war, that they rid themselves of prejudices of an antisocial character. It's little comfort to fight for a drink, a lift, a glad hand. What I want is that the future is free of war. I don't want anyone to feel indulgent toward a young lad because he may be killed . . ."

—From a Coast Guardsman's letter

MADAME CHIANG KAI-SHEK *assures us that China is ready to cooperate with the United States and the other United Nations in creating a better society for all mankind, with special privileges for none.**

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress of the United States: .

At any time, it would be a privilege for me to address Congress, more especially this present august body which will have so much to do in shaping the destiny of the world. In speaking to Congress I am literally speaking to the American people. The Seventy-seventh Congress, as their representatives, fulfilled the obligations and responsibilities of its trust by declaring war on the aggressors. That part of the duty of the people's representatives was discharged in 1941. The task now confronting you is to help win the war and to create and uphold a lasting peace which will justify the sacrifices and sufferings of the victims of aggression.

Before enlarging on this subject, I should like to tell you a little about my long and vividly interesting trip to your country from my own land which has bled and borne unflinchingly the burden of war for more than 5½ years. I shall not dwell, however, upon the part China has played in our united effort to free mankind from brutality and violence. I shall try to convey to you, however imperfectly, the impressions gained during the trip.

First of all, I want to assure you that the American people have every right to be proud of their fighting men in so many parts of the world. I am particularly thinking of those of your boys in the far-flung, out-of-the-way stations and areas where life is attended by dreary drabness—this because their duty is not one of spectacular performance and they are not buoyed up by the excitement of battle. They are called upon, day after colorless day, to perform routine duties such as safeguarding defenses and preparing for possible enemy action. It has been said, and I find it true from personal experience, that it is easier to risk one's life on the battlefield than it is to perform customary humble and humdrum duties which, however, are just as necessary to winning the war. Some of your

troops are stationed in isolated spots, quite out of reach of ordinary communications. Some of your boys have had to fly hundreds of hours over the sea from an improvised airfield in quests, often disappointingly fruitless, of enemy submarines. They, and others, have to stand the monotony of waiting—just waiting. But, as I told them, true patriotism lies in possessing the morale and physical stamina to perform faithfully and conscientiously the daily tasks so that in the sum total the weakest link is the strongest.

Your soldiers have shown conclusively that they are able stoically to endure homesickness, the glaring dryness and scorching heat of the tropics, and keep themselves fit and in excellent fighting trim. They are amongst the unsung heroes of this war, and everything possible to lighten their tedium and buoy up their morale should be done. That sacred duty is yours. The American Army is better fed than any army in the world. This does not mean, however, that they can live indefinitely on canned food without having the effects tell on them. These admittedly are the minor hardships of war, especially when we pause to consider that in many parts of the world, starvation prevails. But peculiarly enough, oftentimes it is not the major problems of existence which irk a man's soul; it is rather the pin pricks, especially those incidental to a life of deadly sameness, with tempers frayed and nervous systems torn to shreds.

The American Pattern of Democracy

The second impression of my trip is that America is not only the cauldron of Democracy, but the incubator of democratic principles. At some of the places I visited, I met the crews of your air bases. There I found first generation Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechoslovakians, and other nationals. Some of them had accents so thick that, if such a thing were possible, one could not cut them with a butter knife. But there they were—all Americans, all devoted to the same ideals, all working for the same cause and united by the same high purpose. No suspicion or

*Before the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., February 18, 1943.

rivalry existed between them. This increased my belief and faith that devotion to common principles eliminates differences in race, and that identity of ideals is the strongest possible solvent of racial dissimilarities.

I have reached your country, therefore, with no misgivings, but with my belief that the American people are building and carrying out a true pattern of the nation conceived by your forebears, strengthened and confirmed. You, as representatives of the American people, have before you the glorious opportunity of carrying on the pioneer work of your ancestors, beyond the frontiers of physical and geographical limitations. Their brawn and thews braved undauntedly almost unbelievable hardships to open up a new continent. The modern world lauds them for their vigor and intensity of purpose, and for their accomplishment. You have today before you the immeasurably greater opportunity to implement these same ideals and to help bring about the liberation of man's spirit in every part of the world. In order to accomplish this purpose, we of the United Nations must now so prosecute the war that victory will be ours decisively and with all good speed.

Sun-tse, the well-known Chinese strategist, said: "In order to win, know thyself and thy enemy." We have also the saying: "It takes little effort to watch the other fellow carry the load."

In spite of these teachings from a wise old past, which are shared by every nation, there has been a tendency to belittle the strength of our opponents.

When Japan thrust total war on China in 1937, military experts of every nation did not give China even a ghost of a chance. But, when Japan failed to bring China cringing to her knees as she wanted, the world took solace in this phenomenon by declaring that they had overestimated Japan's military might. Nevertheless, when the greedy flames of war inexorably spread in the Pacific following the perfidious attack on Pearl Harbor, Malaya, and lands in and around the China Sea, and one after another of these places fell, the pendulum swung to the other extreme. Doubts and fears lifted their ugly heads and the world began to think that the Japanese were Nietzschean supermen, superior in intellect and physical prowess, a belief which the Gobineaus and the Houston Chamberlains and their apt pupils, the Nazi racists, had propounded about the Nordies.

Again, now the prevailing opinion seems to consider the defeat of the Japanese as of relative

unimportance and that Hitler is our first concern. This is not borne out by actual facts, nor is it to the interests of the United Nations as a whole to allow Japan to continue, not only as a vital potential threat but as a waiting sword of Damocles, ready to descend at a moment's notice.

Let us not forget that Japan in her occupied areas today has greater resources at her command than Germany.

Let us not forget that the longer Japan is left in undisputed possession of these resources, the stronger she must become. Each passing day takes more toll in lives of both Americans and Chinese.

Let us not forget that the Japanese are an intransigent people.

Let us not forget that during the first 4½ years of total aggression China has borne Japan's sadistic fury unaided and alone.

The victories won by the United States Navy at Midway and the Coral Sea are doubtless steps in the right direction—they are merely steps in the right direction—for the magnificent fight that was waged at Guadalcanal during the past six months attests to the fact that the defeat of the forces of evil though long and arduous will finally come to pass. For have we not on the side of righteousness and justice staunch allies in Great Britain, Russia, and other brave and indomitable peoples? Meanwhile the peril of the Japanese Juggernaut remains. Japanese military might must be decimated as a fighting force before its threat to civilization is removed.

We Must Have Vision

When the Seventy-seventh Congress declared war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, Congress, for the moment, had done its work. It now remains for you, the present representatives of the American people, to point the way to win the war, to help construct a world in which all peoples may henceforth live in harmony and peace.

May I not hope that it is the resolve of Congress to devote itself to the creation of the post-war world? To dedicate itself to the preparation for the brighter future that a stricken world so eagerly awaits?

We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action,

for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must of necessity affect all other peoples.

The term "hands and feet" is often used in China to signify the relationship between brothers. Since international inter-dependence is now so universally recognized, can we not also say that all nations should become members of one corporate body?

The 160 years of traditional friendship between our two great peoples, China and America, which has never been marred by misunderstandings, is unsurpassed in the annals of the world. I can also assure you that China is eager and ready to cooperate with you and other peoples to lay a true and lasting foundation for a sane and progressive world society which would make it impossible for any arrogant or predatory neighbor to plunge future generations into another orgy of blood. In the past China has not computed the cost to her manpower in her fight against aggression, although she well realized that manpower is the real wealth of a nation and it takes generations to grow it. She has been soberly conscious of her

responsibilities and has not concerned herself with privileges and gains which she might have obtained through compromise of principles. Nor will she demean herself and all she holds dear to the practice of the market place.

We in China, like you, want a better world, not for ourselves alone, but for all mankind, and we must have it. It is not enough, however, to proclaim our ideals or even to be convinced that we have them. In order to preserve, uphold, and maintain them, there are times when we should throw all we cherish into our effort to fulfill these ideals even at the risk of failure.

The teachings drawn from our late leader, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, have given our people the fortitude to carry on. From 5½ years of experience we in China are convinced that it is the better part of wisdom not to accept failure ignominiously, but to risk it gloriously. We shall have faith that, at the writing of peace, America and our other gallant allies will not be obtunded by the mirage of contingent reasons of expediency.

Man's mettle is tested both in adversity and in success. Twice is this true of the soul of a nation.

THE MINISTER FROM NEW ZEALAND, WALTER NASH, emphasizes that the post-war policy of Great Britain and the Dominions rests firmly on the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, and proposes that the United Nations take immediate steps to turn those principles into working realities.*

The attitude of mind of the British Commonwealth toward the future is one of the subjects which arouses the greatest interest in the United States today. Indeed, it seems to arouse more interest in the United States than even inside the British Commonwealth itself. That interest is something which I think should be encouraged to the full, because it shows that American public opinion is genuinely concerned with the future of the world and not merely with the future of America, and it indicates that there is a sincere desire in this country to see the Atlantic Charter made a document of reality. As a representative of one of the Dominions of the British Commonwealth, I therefore welcome this American interest

in the future of the nations and peoples which form the British Commonwealth, and I greatly appreciate the opportunity to put forward a New Zealand point of view about the manner in which the Commonwealth faces the future and some suggestions from a New Zealand point of view about the future not only of the British Commonwealth, but of the United Nations at large.

Definition of the Commonwealth

The first task in discussing this question of the British Commonwealth and the future seems to me that of making absolutely sure that we all understand exactly what we mean by the British Commonwealth. There are two meanings commonly attached to the term. It is taken by some to con-

*Before the United Nations Forum at Constitution Hall, Washington, February 15, 1943.

sist of the United Kingdom and the other self-governing nations, that is to say, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Irish Free State. This interpretation in other words confines the use of the word Commonwealth to those British nations which have attained full independent nationhood and are tied together only by common allegiance to the Crown and the common traditions and interests arising from their British origin. The other interpretation includes inside the Commonwealth India and the dependencies of the United Kingdom, that is to say, India and all that vast group of territories which form what is generally called the British Colonial Empire and which range from areas on the verge of self-government to island colonies like Malta and the Falkland Islands. I think this second is the sounder definition, and I think for the purpose of this discussion we should take the British Commonwealth as consisting of the United Kingdom and its colonial dependencies, the independent Dominions, and India.

It is no wonder that this Commonwealth is of the greatest interest to other people of the world besides the British, for it occupies over one-quarter of the known surface of the globe and its population exceeds one-quarter of the estimated number of the human race. In 1931, the last year for which figures of any reliability were available relating to the whole area of the Commonwealth, it is estimated that the white population was 70 million, mainly British but partly French, Dutch, and Spanish. But the total population of the Commonwealth is between 500 and 600 million—more than half of which are in India and Ceylon. The remainder in large proportions include Africans, Arabs, Malaysians, Chinese, Polyynesians, and other Pacific Islanders in many smaller groups.

Side by side with this great variety of races comes almost as great a variety of religions—Hindus, Mohammedans, Christians, Buddhists, Animists, Sikhs, Jains, Parsees, Jews, and countless tribal religions.

I have not time here to go fully into the constitutions and exact legal relations that bind to the United Kingdom the Crown Colonies, dependencies, and territories which go to make up the areas known generally as the Colonial Empire, but I will endeavor to answer any questions that time permits—there is, however, one relationship inside the Commonwealth which I must stress.

The Free British Nations

I propose to discuss the Dominions section of the Commonwealth. The most important point is the relationship between the self-governing Dominions and the United Kingdom. This is laid down in the Statute of Westminster, 1931, which states that the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations are united by common allegiance to the Crown. The text, however, usually quoted as defining the legal position of the British Dominions is the Balfour Declaration of 1926 which states "that the United Kingdom and the Dominions are autonomous communities within the British Empire equal in status, not in any way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

The most important point which emerges from this definition is that the different parts of the Commonwealth are free, independent, self-governing nations and that they have their own individual opinions about the future. Therefore, when one discusses the British Commonwealth facing the future, one discusses not the policy of the Commonwealth as a whole, but the individual policies supported or advocated by the different Dominions and the United Kingdom.

This is a point which I must stress. I find that in the United States there exists still a surprising lack of knowledge about this exact relationship of the Dominions to the United Kingdom. We have had queries coming into the New Zealand Legation, for instance, asking whether we pay taxes to Great Britain, and people have suggested to us that after the war, naturally the British Dominions would want to shake off the rule of England and become independent. These are, of course, quite meaningless statements. The people of the British Dominions do not, of course, pay any taxes or any tribute of any sort to anyone except their own governments, and they are completely independent. One proof of that independence is the fact that each Dominion separately declared war against the Axis without urging or suggestion from the United Kingdom. In fact, the most striking proof of the independence of the Dominions is the fact that Eire has remained neutral in this struggle with the Axis.

In foreign policy, even though our actions are naturally very closely coordinated, we have at times expressed views differing from the foreign

policy of the United Kingdom. If you examine, for instance, the history of the League of Nations in the years immediately preceding the war you will find that my own country, New Zealand, for instance, along with one other country, Russia, urged that the Chinese-Japanese war should be brought before the League of Nations. You will find that we differed quite sharply from the British Government on the question of the Spanish Civil War and we were in favor of a tougher policy against the Japanese in the immediate pre-war years than was believed in by the United Kingdom Government.

Other Dominions have expressed their own opinions perhaps in differing ways with the same freedom and frankness. Therefore, when we discuss this question of the British Commonwealth facing the future, we are not discussing the question of one single integrated body like the United States of America, but we are discussing the attitude of an association of states each with its own opinions and own views.

Common Denominators

Though the different parts of the British Commonwealth are independent and have, as a result of their historical background, their geographical position and their political ideas, differing conceptions about the future, certain factors influence them all and tend to bring a considerable degree of similarity in the fundamentals of their policies. These factors are:

(a) The fact that the Dominions and the United Kingdom are not only members of the *British Commonwealth of Nations*, but also members of the *United Nations*. They all signed on January 1, 1942, the United Nations' Declaration signifying their adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Just as in pre-war years, they were—and indeed at the present time they are—members of the League of Nations as well as of the British Commonwealth, they are now a part of the United Nations as well as of the Commonwealth. The only Dominion which is not a member of the United Nations is once again Eire. Yet the Irish showed themselves one of the most active and strongest supporters of the League of Nations and there is no doubt that they are prepared to play their part in any world organization of the future whether that be a revived League or a United Nations body. Mr. De Valera speaking on October 5, 1941, has stated this clearly.

"We have shown ourselves ready to join in any world organization of free peoples designed for the general welfare of mankind and for the maintenance of peace on the only basis on which peace can be built and endure: justice for all and fair play for the little as for the great. We are ready to make, as members in such an organization, the same sacrifices that other nations make. We can do no more."

(b) The second great fact affecting the Commonwealth is that all parts of it are influenced to a greater or less extent by the two other predominant powers in the present-day world, United States of America and Russia.

These two factors, the United Nations concept and the tremendous power and influence of the United States and Russia, affect all the members of the British Commonwealth.

Cornerstone of the Future

Let us look at the first of these two factors, the influence of the United Nations concept on the future policy of the British Commonwealth. Not only have the governments of the separate parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations adhered to the Atlantic Charter, but their leaders have made declarations reaffirming their adherence to the principles of the Charter and the Four Freedoms.

In England or on behalf of England many such declarations have been made. After all it is a point worth remembering that the Atlantic Charter originally came into being as a result of the meeting between the President of the United States and the British Prime Minister, and the document was prepared at least in part by the British. That this acceptance of the Charter is the cornerstone of British post-war policy is clear if you look at the statements of any of the main British leaders.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for the Colonies, London, said on June 2, 1942: "We have already put our names to the Atlantic Charter. This lays down the fundamental principles on which the peace settlement must be based, and I do not think there is anyone . . . who dissents from these principles . . . His Majesty's Government regard themselves as absolutely pledged to carry out the Atlantic Charter, and all the Articles of the Atlantic Charter."

Lord Halifax speaking on February 26, 1942, to the American Academy of Political and Social Science, said: "We have vast resources which,

when fully mobilized, will be decisive. When that happens we shall have, not for the first time, a tremendous opportunity to set the world once again on its feet. Who is going to do it? The United Nations. Every one of them will have a contribution to make and the greatest of them will have to make the greatest contribution."

Clement Richard Attlee, Secretary of State for the Dominions, said in London, June 4, 1942: "The Atlantic Charter remains the basis of His Majesty's Government's policy . . ."

This has been underlined by a clear statement by the Foreign Secretary that the British Government is prepared to consider specific institutions of an international character in the future, to implement the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. Eden on July 29, 1942, said in the House of Commons: "His Majesty's Government is entirely in favor of the establishment, or reestablishment, after the war of an international court of justice. It is the view of His Majesty's Government that international authority after this war will require to be backed by international force. In this respect also, we are in entire agreement with the United States Secretary of State."

Let us turn for a moment to the Dominions. On October 1, 1942, Mr. Evatt, the Australian Minister of External Affairs, speaking at Canberra, said: "This country, like all the other United Nations, has pledged itself to the task of achieving the broad objectives embodied in the Atlantic Charter and in the historic declaration of the four essential human freedoms—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear—anywhere and everywhere in the world. These declarations are not legal instruments, technically binding on Australia. But they are far more. They are solemn pledges of our dedication as a nation to the great ends of economic security, social justice, and individual freedom. Do we intend to carry out these pledges? The answer is 'Yes; we must.'"

Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, in his eloquent address to the Pilgrims of the United States, December 2, 1942, New York, said: "Victory and peace will some day crown the sacrifice of those who fight for freedom. When that day comes the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the people of the United States will be found at each other's side, united more closely than ever, but they will be part of a large company. In that company all the nations now united in the defense

of freedom will remain united in the service of mankind."

Field Marshal Smuts, Prime Minister of South Africa, in an article in *Life* magazine—a periodical which appears to have become one of the main platforms in this country for discussing the future of the British Commonwealth—said of the post-war period: "It will be a world governed by the Atlantic Charter and similar international instruments."

Words Are Not Enough

That does in itself, I think, make clear the position of the other Dominions and the United Kingdom. The position of New Zealand, I may say, is very definite on these questions. We have signed and we intend to do everything we can to assist in the implementing of the Atlantic Charter. We believe in it as a policy. We advocated similar principles so far as we were able in the pre-war years at Geneva. In 1936, for instance, in a memorandum to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, we urged the establishment of a stronger League of Nations and an international police force which could make a reality of the ideas of collective security and collective progress. Our views are even more definite today than then. Belief and words are not enough. New Zealand believes that action is required.

The Atlantic Charter and its companion concept, the Four Freedoms, affect vitally the whole future of the British Commonwealth, because within the boundaries of the Commonwealth and particularly within that section of it known as the Colonial Empire lie some of the peoples whose standards of living, education, and opportunity can be and should be raised considerably. India is, of course, the most important of all these areas.

It is at this point that some of the most burning issues of the future raise their heads. India is, of course, the test case. I do not want here to go into the question in detail, simply because I have not the time, but I do want to stress that after examining all the facts I am convinced that the British offer to India was a frank one and a fair one, and that it was made as a genuine attempt to achieve complete independence for the Indian people. The same opinion is shared by the leading statesmen of the other British Dominions.

I think it is a striking fact that the Dominions, who are themselves extremely proud of their independent status as well as of their association with

the Commonwealth, and who well realize the extreme danger which the refusal to grant self-government to a region which is ready for it would be to the whole idea of the British Commonwealth, have never once criticized the policy of the British in India. That criticism has not been made because we were not able to make it, it has not been made because we believe in the sincerity and the honesty of the British offer. I can assure you that the New Zealand Government will be certainly anxious to see at the first practical opportunity the institution of genuine independent rule for the Indian people.

Sir Stafford Cripps in a broadcast on March 30, 1942, said: "We want to make it clear and without any possibility of doubt or question that the British Government and the British people desire the Indian people to have full self-government, with a constitution as free in every respect as our own in Great Britain, or as any of the great Dominion members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

"In the words of the draft declaration, India would be associated with the United Kingdom and other Dominions by common allegiance to the Crown, and equal to them in every respect, and in no way subordinate in any aspect of her domestic or external affairs."

At the same time, Lord Cranborne on his retirement from the position of Colonial Secretary, made a clear and unequivocal statement on the United Kingdom's intention to apply the same principles of development toward self-government to the other parts of the Colonial Empire.

"It must be clearly our aim," Cranborne said, "to equip the colonial people to administer their own affairs whether our goal is nearer or far. That is one of the main aims that British colonial policy sets itself. We have made and are making considerable progress. The process of development which I have tried to describe has no fixed limits, it is a continuing process; there is no 'so far and no further' in our policy; we have seen how old colonies like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa have grown into great self-governing nations on absolute equality with Great Britain and responsible for their own affairs, each bound to her by an enduring bond of loyalty to the Crown. I see our Colonial Empire moving along the same road not perhaps in their present isolation, but more closely associated in wider groups planning an ever-growing part in the British Commonwealth of Nations."

We Cannot Afford Imperialism

I am not standing here tonight with any desire to whitewash any dark spots in the British Empire. I do not present for one minute that there are not phases of its colonial policy and its colonial development of which I have been critical, nor do I deny that there were at least a number of places in which much more should have been done than has been done. But the point I want to make is this. Inside the British Commonwealth system there has been a definite policy and philosophy providing for the self-development and self-government of all areas that have come under its control. The British Commonwealth has aimed at training up its people toward the day when they can take over their own affairs. The Commonwealth has remained a democratic evolutionary body which can point to the development of the independent Dominions as a great step forward in the principles of international development.

But while I realize the uneven patches in this development and realize the value of criticism to the British Commonwealth, I think it is very important when people criticize, to examine exactly the type of structure they want to put in the place of the British Commonwealth, and I want to say emphatically that there is no use criticizing or attacking the British Commonwealth if the alternative that is proposed is simply another imperialism. The British Commonwealth is developing out of the imperialist stage into something more—and something better. Nothing would be gained and indeed the world would be put back considerably, I believe, if simply another new type of imperialism is introduced to the world. We cannot afford the extension of any kind of imperialism, we cannot afford to foster the rise of a new imperialism. And while I agree wholeheartedly with those who want to see a faster development in the colonial areas, I think it would be simply putting the clock back if another form of imperialism comes into being allegedly to secure this development.

While I still stress my own belief that the process of development in some parts of the British Commonwealth can be speeded up, I would like to suggest to those people who are the most ardent critics of the type of government which prevails in some parts of the Commonwealth that they should look very closely into the local factors affecting each case before making their pronouncements.

I have had myself some personal experience of the administrative difficulties and problems which arise, for instance, in Fiji, and these problems are by no means peculiar to this one area. The problem in Fiji is that not only are there a great number of Fijians there, but there are a great number of Indians, emigrants from India, who have come into the island. The figures for 1938, the latest reliable ones available, show the native population consisting of 49.5 percent of the total population, the white population 2 percent, the Chinese 0.9 percent, the Japanese 0.03 percent, and the Indian 43.8 percent. Since then the proportion of Indians has increased so that they are now close to equality with the Fijians. At once, one is up against a problem if home rule is given to an area like Fiji. Should we not take the steps necessary to ensure that the Fijians are given the maximum freedom and share of government?

There is also a general legislative council consisting of 17 official members including the governor; 5 nonofficial whites, 2 of whom are nominated by the authorities and 3 elected; 5 Indian members, who get office in the same way; and 5 native Fijians nominated from a list submitted by the council of chiefs. But white and Indian voters are subject to a small property or income qualification. In addition, the town of Suva has a mayor and municipal council.

Steps Toward Reconstruction

Let me recapitulate for a moment and stress that the point which I have been bringing this evidence forward to prove is that the Dominions and the United Kingdom are sincere in their adherence to the Atlantic Charter and in their desire to see the principles of the Atlantic Charter implemented. If anyone doubts that sincerity, I suggest they look further at the widespread discussion which is going on, particularly inside the United Kingdom, not merely for the desirability of a better world for the future, but of the particularly specific steps to be taken toward achieving that world. The Beveridge scheme has received a great deal of publicity and attention. This is natural because it lays the foundations for social security in Great Britain. It is of particular interest to New Zealand because the scheme has been drawn up after a close study of the New Zealand Social Security scheme which was adopted in 1938 and which the Beveridge scheme resembles in many respects. But this is not the only scheme of this nature which has been

put forward in Britain. There has been the Uthwatt report on town planning in which many proposals for the rebuilding not only of the bombed areas of Britain, but other areas of bad housing and bad conditions, have been carefully considered. There has been the Scott report on the future of British agriculture and on the use of rural land. Other studies have been carried out by a great variety of bodies in Great Britain. Britain has already done splendid work in connection with post-war relief and rehabilitation.

The point I want to stress about these bodies is that they are not engaged in attempting to elaborate general principles, but are trying to work out specifically what is to be done. In the same way in New Zealand we have our own rehabilitation and reconstruction schemes, some of which we intend to put into operation to the full the moment war stops. These are attempts to get our own house completely in order, but I realize that they are only part of the problem.

The other part of the problem is, of course, the question of international planning, particularly on economic questions. In this field there have been no clear statements of the economic or political policy which is to be followed in achieving the results of the Atlantic Charter. The British Commonwealth nations have not yet committed themselves to any one definite policy. I think it is important, however, to stress the fact that during the war we have ourselves adopted and accepted the lend-lease principles. There are reciprocal lend-lease agreements between the United Kingdom and the United States, between Australia and the United States, between New Zealand and the United States.

Under these agreements, we are supplying considerable quantities of material to the United States forces in New Zealand. For instance, we are supplying the bulk of the foodstuffs consumed by all the United States Forces in the South Pacific. To put it into more specific terms, the men fighting now in the jungles of Guadalcanal are eating New Zealand butter, New Zealand meat, New Zealand vegetables and part of their supplies and equipment comes from our Dominion.

But while lend-lease is one of the greatest steps forward that have been taken in a practical way toward the development of the type of a post-war world based on the principles of securing the fullest use of resources and the widest distribution of wealth, I realize that it is not in itself enough.

We still have to do, inside the British Commonwealth and, I suggest, inside the United States of America and the other United Nations, a great deal of hard specific thinking about the future world. We need to get, I suggest, an organization which I would call a World Development and Reconstruction Council into being now to settle down and thrash out around the conference table exactly how we are going to arrange the economic structure of the world after the war.

Economic questions go very deep into the realities of life. They are questions on which feelings can run very high and very bitterly. We must, therefore, try to get them solved while we are still welded together by the sense of common danger and common purpose, or else we may have great difficulty in getting the necessary agreement after the war and this is a thing in which the British Commonwealth must play its part. It is a thing also in which the United States and every other country of the world including Russia must play their part. We need this kind of reconstruction council and we need it now. To postpone it is simply to postpone coming to grips with reality.

The Importance of the Soviet Union

Obviously the two countries with which we must have a fullest discussion of these questions are the United States and Russia. This brings me to the point which I made earlier, that the other great factor which influences at present all the members of the British Commonwealth is the existence in the same world as themselves of those two great powers, one representative of your own country and the other of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Let us look for one moment at the influence which Russia exerts. There is the tremendous prestige of Russia as a result of her almost incredible endurance and her magnificent military achievements. These have had a profound effect on the feelings of the people of the British Commonwealth. This is a point which must be stressed. It is due to the fact that Russia stopped the Nazi tide rolling on and threatening to engulf us in one of the most critical periods in the whole of the war.

If anyone feels that we of the British Commonwealth are apt to get sentimental about the Russians, let them think back to the situation which faced us in June 1941. We were just

managing to hold Rommel out of Egypt; our forces in the Middle East were critically weakened by the necessary but serious losses we had faced in Greece and Crete; the new armies in Britain were only just getting the material necessary to enable them to stand up to invasion; the Royal Navy and the Dominion Navies were stretching their resources in every part of the world. If the Germans had been able to finish off the Russians quickly they could have swung part of their armies down and endangered the Middle East very gravely and turned against Britain with the remainder. All of this was prevented by the Russian resistance. No wonder the ordinary Englishman who expected invasion hourly throughout the year 1940 to 1941 or the ordinary Dominion soldier who in the Middle East saw the Russians pinning down the German armored divisions which otherwise might have been hurled through Turkey to assist Rommel, feels that he owes much to the Russians.

This appreciation of Russia's war effort and this immense respect for the Russians' strength naturally means that in the post-war world Russia will always be a welcome member of the United Nations. Her influence will be very great for that reason. It is essential to secure the closest possible contact between Russia and the other members of the United Nations as soon as possible. There is far too much suspicion even now between the other countries of the United Nations and Russia. We need more understanding on both sides. We must do everything we can to destroy the suspicion and distrust of Russia which exists in the outside world, and Russia for her part must do everything she can on that side.

In connection hereto it is important to reflect that there is a legal document which lays down the relationship between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom. This is the treaty made on May 26, 1942, which is described as "The Treaty of Alliance in the War against Hitlerite Germany and her associates in Europe and of collaboration and mutual assistance thereafter concluded between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland." In article V, it says: "The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests of the security of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration *after the reestablishment of peace for the organization of security and economic prosperity in Europe.* They will take into account the interests

of the United Nations in these objects, and they will act in accordance with the two principles of not seeking territorial aggrandizement for themselves and of noninterference in the internal affairs of other States." Article VI reads: "The High Contracting Parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war. . . ."

This treaty was negotiated with the full knowledge and understanding of the Dominions and though they are not bound by it they certainly concurred in the policy expressed in it.

The Price of Permanent Peace

The other great country influencing the future of the British Commonwealth is, as I have stated before, your own country, the United States of America. There is no doubt that the United States will emerge at the end of the war one of the mightiest powers in the military, naval, and economic spheres in the world. There is a strong common interest between the United States and the Dominions because we have all the same traditions of independence and initiative of the frontier fighting spirit. In certain areas, particularly in the South Pacific, members of the British Commonwealth are in a very close strategic relationship to the United States. Let me put this into more specific terms. We in New Zealand—and I will speak at this moment also on behalf of our sister Dominion Australia—at this stage realize the tremendous debt we owe to the United States Navy for our defense in 1942. The Battle of the Coral Sea, the Battle of Midway, the Battle of the Solomons were of course not only battles for the defense of Australia and New Zealand. We know that both Australia and New Zealand are of great importance strategically to the United States. If we were knocked out by the Japanese, the task of reducing Japan would be made ultimately much more difficult and it would cost countless more American lives. But we know that we owe a very great deal to the United States Navy, Army, and Marines—more than we can easily express.

This unity of strategic interest binds us very closely at the present moment and adds to the other natural warm ties between our countries. For that reason, as I have stated earlier, we are particularly appreciative of the interest taken by the United States public in the future of the British Commonwealth.

At this point there is one thing I want to stress. It is a thing which I think must be said very

frankly and it is this—the first basic interest in the post-war world must be the establishment of international security, and any action in this direction is futile unless America plays a big part in it. It is no use going ahead trying to make a richer and better world if in that world there is going to be no sound means of insuring international peace. I believe profoundly that one of the essential, if not the essential factors, in securing peace is a healthy economic readjustment of the world. But in order to get that readjustment we must have the political mechanism for securing and maintaining peace. That is a point which is not only made by New Zealand, it is a point which every Dominion has stressed and stressed very strongly.

This post-war security cannot be secured unless the United States is prepared to play fully her role in it. I suggest to you that that is the essential counterpart to the great and profound desire in this country to see justice done to the backward peoples of the world and particularly to those areas where backward people live inside the British Commonwealth.

At times the development of self-government and of independence in colonial territories can endanger gravely the whole strategic future of a nation or group of nations and I suggest frankly that the gradual steps towards self-government of the present colonial sections of the British Commonwealth can be expedited and can only be expedited if the United States is prepared to stand squarely in the securing of international peace.

The price, for instance, which must be paid by those people in the United States who demand that India should have independence is that they must be prepared to help maintain security in the world if that security is in any way endangered by the granting of Indian independence. India's security holds the key to the freedom of China. We cannot afford at the present time to take any steps which might endanger the action necessary for the relief of China.

Let me state the same opinion in connection with other parts of the British Commonwealth. If, for instance, the British should give complete freedom to points of great strategic importance like Malta, the Suez Canal Zone, Aden, or any other strategic regions you wish to name, she can do so only if she knows that these regions will not be militarily necessary to check aggression in another world war. And the only sure way in which we can es-

tablish that they are not necessary for such a task or for such a war is to know that there is in existence an effective system for preventing another war. That system cannot come into being unless the United States is prepared to play a full part in it. If the responsibility for granting full independence is to be a joint one, then the responsibility for the maintenance of security must be a joint one. Panama, for instance, bears somewhat the same relationship to the world of the Americas as some of those other points to the British Commonwealth. It may be that the United Nations can reach agreement regarding the insuring of the continuity of these necessary safeguards for world peace and security. I certainly hope they can.

Professor E. H. Carr, that penetrating British political writer, puts it very succinctly in his latest book, when he says: "One of the gravest dangers ahead is that American influence will be employed to frame a peace settlement of a character which could be maintained only by American power, and that American power will not in fact be available to maintain it."

If American public opinion is anxious to see the extension of self-government to ultimate complete independence, then they must accept their full responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security in the world in the future.

Commonwealth and United Nations

The future world organization as I have shown from the range of quotations from British and Dominion statesmen must rest on the Atlantic Charter and on the concept of the United Nations. But I want to stress here that there is no sign, to my knowledge, inside the present governments of the British Commonwealth of any desire for that Commonwealth to be superseded as a political organization by any other international group. They are all ready to accept and to make and to keep the pledges given on January 1, 1942. The members of the British Commonwealth are, as I see it, anxious and in every way willing to play the fullest part they can in a United Nations organization, but there is no reason why that organization should lead to the dissolution of the British Commonwealth. There have been no statements from any members of the Dominions which indicated that the separate members of the Commonwealth have any desire to see that body dissolved. We all want to play our part in the United Nations, but we all

have grown up and attained our national self-development within the structure of the British Commonwealth and we have not found it to date an organization which impeded our growth or self-development; to the contrary it has been an organization which has enabled us to attain a degree of fullness and stature which might not have been possible otherwise. This is a point which it is very important to remember. Our obligations to the British Commonwealth are not in any way in opposition to the Atlantic Charter, except that the latter is a signed obligation and the first is not.

As I see it, summing up the general trend of the future policy of members of the British Commonwealth, the following facts emerge:

- (1) The independent Dominions and the United Kingdom stand four-square on the principle of implementing the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms.

- (2) They desire to see the United Nations organization developed in the post-war world.

- (3) They do not believe that such an organization is in any way incompatible with the idea of the British Commonwealth, or that it need lead to the dissolution of the British Commonwealth.

- (4) They believe that the immediate and prime point of importance to be secured by the United Nations organization is security.

- (5) They are profoundly influenced by the policy of the United States and Russia and they believe that one essential immediate contribution which both these states should make to the post-war world is to be part of the United Nations organization of collective security.

This is not a suggestion that the United States or Russia should be primarily responsible for policing the world or insuring that security. The British Commonwealth, I am sure, will play its part to the full in any such obligations—as it can claim to have played its part to the full in stopping the Axis attempt to dominate the world. But all must be in on that task of future security. Mr. Eden has expressed that point of view very vividly in a recent speech. He said, "We have a direct and inescapable responsibility for peace at all times. This is a responsibility which is not ours alone. We share it with the other nations of the world. We have continually to revise our understanding of geography. Before ever this war began the world was shrinking before our eyes. The war has accelerated that process. The world after the war will be a still smaller place. There will be no

room for isolation, no room for selfish policies or unneighborly policies. There will be but one village street from Edinburgh to Chungking . . ."

The Greater Union

From this let me go on to one final point which is in my mind—the most important of all. That point is that neither the British Commonwealth, nor the United States, nor Russia, nor China, nor any other group of powers can alone settle the future problems of the world. The British Commonwealth is a great organization, so is the United States of America, so is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, so is China, but no one of them can secure the future peace or development of the world alone. We must have a coordinated developed United Nations body in the post-war world. There is room and necessity for a nation of Greeks, Norwegians, Swiss, New Zealanders, Dutch, and many other great nations, even if small nations in population and area. Indeed, I would go further and say we require a coordinated developed United Nations body now, and I would suggest the following immediate steps toward the creation of that body:

(1) A meeting of the United Nations should be summoned within the near future.

(2) This meeting of the United Nations should function as a Post-War Reconstruction and Development Council which should set in motion at once the work necessary to iron out the problems and difficulties which must be faced.

(3) There should be set up at once a United Nations Council to consider war problems and in particular a Council of the Big Four, United States, Russia, China, and the British Commonwealth, to

determine the general strategic policy necessary to defeat the Axis powers.

(4) The Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms should be passed by the legislators of all the United Nations as being the cornerstone of their foreign policy.

I understand that all the signatories to the Washington Declaration are committed to the Atlantic Charter.

We must set to work now and make the United Nations concept and the Atlantic Charter into working realities. That is, I believe, the policy the British Commonwealth must have in mind in facing the future. But I would go even further. I would say that it is the policy which not only the British Commonwealth but the United States of America and every one of the United Nations must have in mind in facing the future, otherwise we will have on us again a catastrophe beside which the present world war will fade into insignificance.

We cannot afford any extension of imperialism, we cannot afford to foster the rise of new imperialism. We either use some of the power implicit in our separate sovereignties to achieve unity—unity for the purpose of achieving security, for achieving a fair distribution of raw material, for maximum production and for maximum trade—as we unite to insure individual freedom internally, or again the old ways in an aggravated form will reappear and the good will perish.

Neither Britain nor America can afford to betray those boys who have given their lives in this war. As a great leader fought for the Union in your country, so must we now fight for that greater union which was pledged by the nations when they united to sign the Atlantic Charter.

GOVERNOR HAROLD E. STASSEN OF MINNESOTA *urges us to take immediate steps in the direction of post-war organization and offers some tentative proposals for a United Nations government.**

I bring you a message from the Middle West. It is this. The men and women of our farms and factories, our offices and our homes, know about the airplane and the radio and mass production. They had loved ones at Pearl Harbor, on Bataan,

at Guadalcanal. They now have sons in northern Africa, over the seven seas, and in European skies. The overwhelming majority of the people of the Midwest know that the walls of isolation are gone forever.

There still are some voices from the past. But the people are ahead of their leaders. They listen

*Before the United Nations Forum, in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., March 8, 1943.

to news reports from far-flung battlefronts. They read of events on other continents. They consider the views of the commentators and the columnists. They may lack some of the detailed information of high vantage points, but they have a perspective of their own and they are thinking things through. There is a rising tide of public opinion that no one can sweep aside. It says that the developments of science have made America a part of a closely knit world with new duties, new responsibilities, and new opportunities.

They have resolved that they will not countenance a weak negotiated peace by compromise. They will back up the men in the armed forces, and the Commander in Chief, until complete decisive victory comes to the Stars and Stripes and the flags of all the United Nations.

But they do not stop at that point. They are thinking beyond the day of victory in the war. They have resolved that these honored dead shall not have died in vain. They are seeking the answers to the problems of lasting peace in the world of tomorrow.

It is to stimulate the search for these answers that I frankly present my views. In keeping with basic principles, we must find the practical, step-by-step advance along the pathway toward a just and durable peace.

A New Level of Government

Realistically recognizing the association of many nations with us in this war, and the fact that together we will have actual jurisdiction over the world on the day of victory, it is my proposal that we begin now to plan and to establish a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World.

The pages of history tell us over and over again that when men are living close together they need a government to prevent anarchy and conflict and tragedy. This has been true from the earliest tribes and clans on through states and nations. The developments of science in travel, trade, and communication clearly indicate that government, limited to a national scale, is not enough. We need a new and higher level of government to serve mankind.

Two world wars and a worldwide depression in a single generation speak loudly and tragically of this need.

Alliances—treaties—pacts between nations are not enough. Just as men living together in a

community must not only agree that they wish to live together in peace but must also establish a mechanism of government to serve them, so the nations of the world must not merely agree that they wish to live together in the world in peace but they must also definitely establish a mechanism of government to serve the people.

This does not mean that the new level of government will take the place of the national level of government. It will not fundamentally disturb domestic sovereignty. Nations will continue to have their own flags, their own constitutions, their own heritage, their own citizens. The new level should be added to carry out those relations to other nations, which have been unsuccessfully conducted by devious diplomacy, international intrigue, balance of power, extraterritoriality, spirals of rising tariffs, devaluated currencies, making and breaking of treaties, and recurring wars.

This new level of government must emphasize human rights rather than nations' rights. Its cornerstone must be a deep respect for the fundamental dignity of man, of every race and color and creed.

One of the most eloquent pleas that has been made for an enlightened peace came from the lips of Madame Chiang Kai-shek in her message to the United States Congress a few days ago. She said:

"We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must of necessity affect all other peoples."

The need for such a higher level of government becomes increasingly apparent as we discuss in tentative but definite terms its functions and its framework.

To Keep the Peace

There are seven activities that will require the gradual development of a government of the United Nations of the World:

First: To establish temporary governments over the Axis nations, preferably headed by citizens of

the United Nations whose ancestry goes back to the Axis nation, to be governed. These temporary governments would disarm the Axis nations and punish their criminal leadership for their betrayal of civilization, but no wholesale reprisals against civilian population should be countenanced.

Need will exist for temporary governments, during a much more limited period, over some of the liberated countries. In these cases, of course, temporary administration should continue only during the period required for the people of such countries to arrive at orderly choices of their own governments. Both in the Axis nations and the liberated countries, individuals placed in temporary administrative charge by the United Nations should be barred from establishing citizenship in those countries, and prevented from holding office when a measure of local autonomy had been restored.

In still other areas, undeveloped or disputed, United Nations trusteeships or territorial administrations will be necessary. These responsibilities will begin before the war is over, and failure of the United Nations to develop a community approach will tend to shape the nature of the peace. The problem of North Africa is small compared to those which will confront us if we continue without an agreed plan by the United Nations as a whole.

Second: To maintain a modern United Nations Legion as a world police force, or "keep the peace" force. No orderly government in all history has been successful without a police force. The best-governed city in the world would return to the law of the jungle in a few years if there were a complete lack of a police force. This was one of the three fatal weaknesses of the League of Nations. Thus, there must be a United Nations police consisting of modern air, naval, and land units. It could be manned by volunteers enlisted on a quota basis from the members of the United Nations.

This does not mean that the individual United Nations should disarm. The individual United Nations, including the United States of America, should maintain strong armaments of their own. This would serve a double purpose. It would be a force that could back up the United Nations Legion, if necessary. It would also be the best safeguard against a breakdown or a perversion of the government of the United Nations of the World. Just as the law-abiding members of the frontier community continued to pack their own

guns long after the first sheriff, with his six-shooter, was installed, so should the law-abiding nations of the world continue to maintain their own armaments after they install the first world-wide police.

In other words, I do not propose that we place all of our eggs in the international basket. But certainly we should place some of them there. They might hatch something better than recurring wars, each of increasing tragedy and horror.

"Certain Unalienable Rights"

Third: To constitute an elementary Bill of Rights and Code of Justice for mankind, and a United Nations Court. It should include the protection of minorities, wherever they may be, the prevention of religious persecution, and the liberation of enslaved peoples.

These human rights of individual men and women are of basic importance. We should not forget the fundamental and ringing declaration of the birth of this country:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are . . . endowed by their Creator, with certain unalienable Rights."

The right of national self-determination must not include the privilege of the majority, after deciding their affiliation and form of government, to persecute the minority.

The tyranny of the majority can be just as vicious as the tyranny of one man.

As Pope Pius XII said in his 1942 Christmas Message, there should be:

" . . . the recognition of the principle that even the State and the functionaries and organizations dependent on it are obliged to repair and to withdraw measures which are harmful to the liberty, property, honor, progress, or health of the individuals."

If we develop human rights, wherever men are found, the exact location of boundary lines will become of less importance and we will gradually work out the perplexing problems of mixed populations.

Commerce in the Air and on the Seas

Fourth: To administer the key international airports and airways of the world. We all recognize the part which airpower now plays in war and will play in keeping and developing the peace. The recent trip of the President and

Winston Churchill to North Africa by air, and Wendell Willkie's 31,000-mile trip around the world, in one airplane and with one crew, leaving this country in one direction and returning to it from another, right on schedule, dramatically emphasize these potentialities. The extreme advances in aircraft building and design, the tens of thousands of war-trained fliers and navigators in many nations, mean breath-taking strides in the air. We must have air tariffs, rules of the air, air traffic and safety controls, elevation channels for flight, coordination of weather data, maintenance of radio beams and communications and of safe and stable airports.

If we fail to develop air administration on a world level, we will not only stifle growth but will give rein to international barrier-raising, cut-throat competition, and power politics which could be the quick cause of another world war. The catch phrase, "international freedom of the air," will not be the answer. It would lead to anarchy of the air and the basic violation of domestic sovereignty. Rather must we seek orderly use of air and reciprocal rights to land under a new level of limited United Nations supervision of world aviation, comparable approximately to that of the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the United States. This would give universal impetus to development of air traffic and contribute much to the relations between men. It would make world cooperation easier to develop and maintain.

Fifth: To administer the gateways to the seas. Ocean commerce and travel will be of great importance—not lessened by the development of air traffic, but playing a vital part in a widening range of total travel, transport, and communication.

Sixth: To increase trade between the peoples of the world. Only thus can general world living standards be improved gradually, and only thus can countries with high living standards maintain them without war. This proposal contemplates no sudden effort to make trade universally free, but simply to stimulate trade on a scale that will surmount barriers which arbitrarily make for scarcity and keep living standards low. Such a program should involve assurances by our own Government to agriculture that the total market for American agriculture will be maintained in ratio to increased world trade. We should also contemplate increased capital investment in undeveloped countries by this and other countries

with large capital resources. This will be one means of maintaining the balance of trade. Stifling obstructions and heavy dumping of goods should be minimized, because these break down economic systems and cause world distress.

It can well be said—what does it profit a nation, if it holds within it all its trade and, earning the jealous dislike of other peoples, sacrifices its sons upon the battlefields?

Seventh: To increase the literacy and improve the health of the people of the world. No one need emphasize the importance of a community-of-nations approach to the problems of health after this war. The result of undernourishment, the ravages of disease, and the wounds of war will require the best that medical science can do to prevent widespread epidemic and suffering lasting for decades. Drawing from the great medical centers of the world, a United Nations Health Service should be developed to give to these problems, in an orderly fashion, the best that medical science can give. In education, the principle of academic freedom should be applied rigorously, and a method should be developed by which the great universities of the world have a definite part in administration of the program. We should no more attempt to indoctrinate people by force with our philosophy of a way of life, either social, economic, or political, than do we approve the Axis perverted incultation. Rather should we develop through the great universities of the world a United Nations insistence upon academic freedom. We must see to it that men and women and children can read and hear and see as they wish. We must make available to them through the printed word, the radio, and the movies the widest possible information. We can also establish local autonomy for education. We must have a fundamental faith in the ultimate result.

Structure of a World Government

Some question may be raised about the justice of having the United Nations Government administer so many of these activities on a worldwide basis, embracing nations and areas which do not have membership in the United Nations. But we have in our midst many men and women who are not citizens of our country—who thus have no voice in our government; yet they are under the jurisdiction of our laws and our courts and are justly treated. They have certain rights, duties, and

responsibilities. They can attain citizenship. On the other hand, many rights of citizenship can be taken away for serious violation of our criminal laws. There may, with equal logic, be nations in the world which must abide by the laws of the United Nations though they have not qualified for membership. Furthermore, the course should be clearly defined by which they may ultimately become members.

In each of these activities, the delegation of power and authority to the government of the United Nations by individual member nations would be limited and specific. All powers not delegated would be expressly reserved to the individual sovereign nations. The citizen would find his city, state, and national governments functioning pretty much as they do now, but there would be introduced a new and higher level of government. It would not be perfect. There would be mistakes. But it would make progress in service of the people.

If any one or more of these functions are to be administered by a United Nations Government, what shall be the form of that government?

Centuries of experience indicate that a legislative or parliamentary body best safeguards human rights. This would recommend that we develop a United Nations Congress or Assembly as the legislative or parliamentary body. The number of seats and voting strength of the United Nations members should be agreed upon on a formula basis that would translate the actual strength of the respective member-nations in the world into comparative voting strength in the parliament. This would mean that population alone would not be the basis of representation, since population is not the only basis for the strength of a nation in the world. Other factors such as literacy, industrial development, the sacrifice of men, and the contribution of materials to win the war, the willingness to carry the burdens of peace, might be considered.

Since a general election of an executive would be impossible, we might well adopt the British method by which the executive springs from the parliament and is accountable to it.

Questions are naturally raised, "Can such an objective be realized? Are not there too many differences of interests, of forms of government, of traits and habits, of the peoples of various nations?" Of course we should not overlook the obstacles. Neither should we underestimate the surging

power of public opinion that is arising throughout the world. This public opinion will insist that some method, other than war, must be found as the basis for the relations between nations. Many are the differences between men, but these are not as powerful as is the common stake of mankind in the prevention of war and the common desire of the people for peace.

Steps in the Right Direction

If we dare to move in this general direction, what are some of the steps that we should take?

We should strengthen the unity between the United Nations in the conduct of the war.

We should develop definite United Nations commissions to handle joint problems, such as the allocation of the food supplies between nations, the reconstruction tasks in liberated territories, and the maintenance of temporary civil governments in such areas.

We must not sacrifice principles in an attempt to secure an easy victory in the war. To build for lasting peace, we must win a victory both for our arms and for our principles. Washington and Lincoln never sacrificed principles in search of an easy victory. It can well be said that if we walk over very many wartime bridges with the devil at our side, we will find him at our side when we sit down to work out the peace, and his presence then will not be helpful.

We must renew the lend-lease program and extend the reciprocal trade treaties.

We must prepare to change our pre-war policies, after the war, so as to promote a healthy domestic economy, encouraging enterprise, production, capital, and initiative. A strong America can contribute in large measure to progress in the world.

We must not permit suspicion or dissension to develop between us and the other United Nations. We must respect Russia, China, the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the United Nations of South and Central America and of Europe, and extend the same courtesy to their internal problems that we expect them to extend to us.

Even with steps such as these, and with a resolute determination to proceed, we must also realize that we will not solve all the problems of the world overnight. These are not fixed goals for 1 year or 10 years or 20 years. We must seek rather to make possible the slow, steady march of progress of self-reliant men.

When considering some such program for world peace and progress, there are those who say, "It cannot be done." Let us not forget that America is great today because over and over again some men did what others said could not be done.

Let us not forget that the progress of mankind through the centuries has been brought about because time after time some men did what others said could not be done.

The winning of this war must come first. It must be uppermost in our minds and thoughts and

deeds. Each of us must add to the total strength of America until victory comes to the United Nations.

But pray God, we begin now to definitely think, and plan, and criticize, and propose, and amend, and devise, and follow through, to initiate the means of winning this peace, an enduring peoples' peace, for the sake of the future welfare and progress of men and women and little children, in this nation and in the other nations of the world.

RAYMOND GRAM SWING *attributes our failure to secure peace after the last war to our inability to understand that what affects other peoples, economically or politically, affects us also.* We see now, he says, "that brotherhood . . . is a crying necessity, a defense, a source of strength."*

Much has been said, in remorse and in truth, of the failure of the generation which planted the tree of peace after the last war to produce any fruit from that tree. No generation can have less to show of constructive achievement after a great war, at least in achievement that a clear victory brought within grasp. If great wars are fought for simple aims and if there is a clear victory, the aims usually are realized. The Revolutionary War made us an independent Nation. The Civil War preserved our Union. Two simple aims were announced for the last war. It was to be the war to end wars. And it was to be a war to make the world safe for democracy. At this moment, to recall those aims is to feel the sharpest whiplash, for few if any greater failures ever stung the minds of men as does the failure to win the last war after victory had been assured on the field of battle. But having said that, let us admit that the failure was not produced by evil, or indeed by a want of effort. Let us see that we have been victims of a far more destructive influence, the fault of short sight.

It happens to have been my own assignment to have reported the last war and to have reported from Europe much of the effort expended to secure the peace, and to preserve the new democracies created after the war. I should not be able to acquit this generation of its failure. But

it is fair to say that it made a tremendous effort. Conference after conference sat, pondered, analyzed, and debated the problems of the peace. Many hopeful gains were made. At moments it seemed as though the great victory was going to be won. More statesmanship was expended than the public knows. Harder, more conscientious work was done than has been acknowledged. In retrospect, one is entitled to the opinion that what was lacking was not the sense of responsibility, but something far more limiting—the scope of mind.

That is not to say that we did not all have an education during the last war on certain primary themes. We learned the meaning of militarism, the importance of political freedom, the rights of self-determination. You who recall those days know they were stirring, and hearts indeed were true in seeking the good. Dreams were dreamed of a better world. Nor do I belittle such dreams by calling them dreams. I say, indeed, that without dreams, in the years of terrible tragedy, the impulse from that tragedy fails to work through to constructive ends. What I do suggest is that the dreams during the last war were not expansive enough and inclusive enough. And the failure after that war was the counterpart of the inadequacy of the dreams. And what should mark the difference between the last war and this is in measure of our dreams. Our dreams today can be and must be greater. The achievements after this war can be and must be greater on that account.

*At the One Hundredth Anniversary Exercises of the Harvard Alumni Association, June 11, 1942.

Political Freedom Is Not Enough

After the last war it was not enough to defeat militarism with superior force. It was not enough to draw up documents giving people self-determination. If war was to end, the conditions which produce war had to be understood and changed. Little enough was said about this by the dreamers of 1917 and 1918. Did they have much thought, for example, for living standards in China and India? Did they care much about bestowing the dignity of full equality on the colored races of the world?

Great as was the last war, in loss of life and wealth, the thinking it produced did not go deeply enough into world relationships. Now we are discovering that our own safety as free Americans is at stake, and its fate is being decided, not behind the defended shores of this continent, but on far-away battlefields and distant seas. Look for a moment at how clear the connection has become between once remote and obscure problems and our own security. We in America suffer from a rubber shortage which is partly due to the fact that the defense of the Malay Peninsula was without the aid of the natives of that region. Had they been brothers of the white democrat in fact, Singapore might not have fallen for many months, or perhaps not at all.

The wonderful resistance of the Chinese, which is a large part of our own security against Japan, has been dealt a deep wound in Burma, and the Burma Road is now cut off. The Japanese victory in Burma was based in part on the aid of the Burmese who had not become brothers of the white man in fact. If we are to win the war, the United Nations must not lose the control of the Indian Ocean, yet who is to say that the Indians themselves have been made sufficiently alive to their membership in our system of human brotherhood to aid in holding India from the Japanese? The resistance in the Philippines turned into a heroic and helpful delaying action through the courage and spirit of the Filipinos. They had been given some measure of brotherhood, and it contributed to our own safety. And we should—and do—begin to see what man has never seen so clearly before: that brotherhood is not a sabbath sentiment, it is a crying necessity, a defense, a source of strength, a relationship without which we ourselves are exposed and in dire danger.

Out of fragments of experience in this war we already are learning that we have a responsibility

to other peoples, no matter how far away they may be; and if this war should be lost it would be because of the inadequacy of our past concept and practice of brotherhood. And if it is won it puts us on the highway to the practice of brotherhood, on a scale surpassing the dreams of the past.

The sufferings of a person or a nation are the same; in them the mind is stretched to encompass truth it could not hold before. Today we of the living generations are seeing truth never before perceived by democratic societies. We are seeing that what we need, if we are to survive as free peoples, is not less but more freedom. We are beginning to perceive that we cannot remain free behind our oceans and coasts while freedom is denied to nations and races anywhere on the planet.

And we are beginning to perceive that political freedom is not of itself sufficient. The world is economic as well as political. Just as political freedom is not safe if it is not part of a world system of political liberties, economic freedom cannot be secure unless it is part of a world order based on economic opportunity for all. We begin to have an inkling of the necessity to our own children and their future that the standard of living shall be raised for millions of men and women in what we call foreign lands, to whose lot we have been comfortably indifferent.

. . . Lest We Perish

In the process of mind-stretching, we do not learn policy. We only see. Policy is the subsequent application of a vision. Today we dream, tomorrow we lay the roads to the realization of the dream. All of us, dreaming of a dignified and peaceful world, may ask ourselves in the anguish of perplexity, how can the dream be realized? How are we going to remain free and yet govern the world by social action? Today we need not concern ourselves too gravely with the difficulties of policy. There is an element of fate in human destiny, not a fate dictated by supernatural powers, but the fate of being circumscribed by our own vision. That which we cannot see we cannot perform. And that which we do see, if we see enough, lies within our ingenuity to achieve. The last war stretched the minds of men to see visions surpassing their previous dreams. They did not establish what they had dreamed. It is said of them scoffingly that they were dreamers. But it should be said of them that they dreamed not wisely enough, and not perceptively enough.

Today we see much more. We behold it in the peril and wrath and the greatest power of destruction mankind has ever devised and encountered. It is no paradox that in such awful hours men envision their greatest and gentlest potentialities. We are striving for a better good. We failed not because we were not good, but because our concept of the good was inadequate. So it is truth that this must be a war of the people for all peoples, a war for the establishment of brotherhood, a war to be followed by strong nations shouldering their responsibility toward those who are backward and

poor. Seeing the war in that perspective, we give the statesmen of the peace the foundation for policy which they did not have after the last war. They tried to build a new world with the tools at hand. And what were the tools? The minds of the men and women of the world. And these minds were partly closed. Now in the ruins of their failure, we must know that our own preservation is in acknowledging the reality of the power of human brotherhood. This time we open our minds to apprehend that, seeing it we must practice it, lest we perish.

ERIC A. JOHNSTON, *president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, writes of the unexplored frontiers in industry and science that will challenge us after the war, at home and abroad.**

The twentieth century has been marked by three great calamities—two world wars and a universal depression. Yet, despite the hazards and uncertainties of the times, few of us would prefer to have lived in a past era.

Americans have conceived and built an age of industrial adventure unprecedented in its benefits and comforts for the so-called common man. We may criticize its inequities and puzzle over the complexities of its vast economic structure, but no land at any time in history has experienced such a rapid advance in special and material gains for its people.

Free schools and public libraries, churches, and medical clinics are available to a majority of Americans. By private or public means, most people are assured security for their old age. The general standard and scale of living has been greatly elevated. The life of man has been lengthened by several years, and cures have been found for formerly fatal diseases.

Materially, it is possible for every man to be an individual king, for he may command machines with the power of thousands of horses. One kind of machine pulls him with the speed of wind over smooth highways. Another machine traps words and music for his entertainment and information. Other machines freeze ice, clean his carpets, cook his food, wash his clothes, and heat his home.

The machine age has brought complexities for modern men which were unknown to his grandfather. But how many Americans would swap their living conditions—their dynamic age of magnificent adventure—for the comparatively drab, uncomfortable, and unsanitary conditions which prevailed 50 or more years ago?

Though we are for most part inclined to take it for granted, the drama of development which has unfolded about us has been exciting and stimulating. Perhaps at some future time writers will record its romance, even as writers have narrated stories based on adventures of our pioneering forefathers.

The Path Behind— and Ahead

But the adventure which lies ahead of us, with the winning of the war, will surpass all others in its challenge, its inspiration and its happiness and hope for all mankind. We have only just begun to penetrate the frontiers of industry, science, and invention. We have just started to explore the world of technology. All our efforts in the past have merely laid the foundations for the future.

When our forefathers faced the challenge of building a new and better world, they faced it without fear, with their bare hands. They overcame the hostility of Indians. They cleared the

*In an article in the *Portland Oregonian*, January 3, 1943.

land and built homes and towns, and railroads and waterways to connect the towns. The first frontier of America, the frontier of land and forest, mountain and stream, was quickly conquered.

And even in the passing of the first frontier, America found a new one, the frontier of machines. With pessimistic finality, there are many who prophesy the end of an epic, the passing of the last American frontier. Their pessimism is understandable.

The world has passed through a decade of demoralizing depression and wide-scale unemployment. Labor and management, in many cases, have been at bitter odds. Even in America, organized group has worked against organized group in a race to see who could dig fastest and deepest into the public pocketbook. Elsewhere, dictatorships have sprung up, and the personal and economic lives of many millions of people have been stifled. Young men have been taught to hate and to kill. Food has been burned or turned under the ground, even as millions went hungry. Factories have been idle, while the potential products of those factories were ardently desired.

It is small wonder that perspectives have been distorted by these tragic flaws in the world economy, small wonder that many see the beginning of the end of the American civilization and the American dream.

We Are Just Beginning

But, fortunately, the facts of the future far outweigh the vicissitudes of the past. Many frontiers are ahead for all who wish to face the challenge of exploration. Beaten paths are for beaten men. It is not the beginning of the end; we are just beginning to begin.

On the American business and industrial front, we have just begun to invade the frontier of chemistry, of light metals, or plastics for a thousand uses. Scientists are at work with atoms as builders work with bricks. And in tremendous laboratories, coal and air and water are transformed into silk—petroleum into rubber.

Deep in a wooded valley of West Virginia, I talked with a chemist in a huge chemical plant. I told him of my admiration for the part he was playing in exploring a new frontier. Quietly and seriously he answered: "In a few years we'll look back on our present-day efforts as a simple form of experimentation." I believe him.

Consider another frontier of the future—the frontier of transportation. The war interrupted a revolution in railroading. With war's end, the railroads will face stiffer competition than ever before in their long and progressive history. The airplane will become commonplace; water and shipping facilities more ample than ever before.

But don't think for a minute the railroads are going to take this competition lying down, quietly passing into an outmoded existence as did the horse and buggy. After all, the railroads were among the first machines. Tomorrow, light metals and more powerful locomotive engines will carry you or your freight faster and more economically than ever. The rebuilding of our railroad system represents in itself a new frontier for America.

It's quite obvious that the airways are to become an integral part of our post-war lives. Our country's airlines are already planning to expand their facilities for the greatly increased number of passengers they will be called upon to accommodate with the coming of victory. You'll fly overseas overnight, and you'll even ship heavy freight through the air.

Still another frontier of the future is ahead for the construction industry. Already, municipal planners are at work, charting the cities and towns of tomorrow. Slum areas will be canceled out; streets and buildings redesigned for the vast flow of mechanized traffic, on the ground and in the air. Architects are drawing plans for houses of peace to fulfill the American post-war demand for at least a million low-cost homes a year.

These are just a few of the obvious frontiers of the future. We fight today for the right to explore this industrial world of tomorrow as free men.

Tomorrow's International World

But the path of post-war adventure and development does not stop at home. Africa, China, Europe, South America are avenues of American exploration, development, and progress. For the conclusion is inescapable that tomorrow's world will be an international world.

America is destined to play a leading role in this international world. In reaction against the war, and to avoid foreign entanglements, many among us would like to encase the country in a hard shell of super-nationalism. Experience shows only too clearly that reversion to such a policy would only lead to a war for another generation of Americans.

We cannot avoid our international responsibilities even if we would.

With victory, we will be virtually the only major country whose resources will be relatively unscathed by the devastating fires of war. Our cities will be intact. Our farmlands bountiful. Our metal and mineral supplies plentiful.

In contrast, Europe and much of the Orient will be blighted with a confused rubble of gutted buildings, destitute business, and starving peoples. Tumbled ruins will stand desolately, in many places, where factories and homes once stood. Almost the entire social and economic order of Europe will be in a state of complete collapse.

As the most powerful nation on earth, America will have no alternative, in the name of decency or in the cause of self-interest, but to help bring order out of this interminable chaos. No other nation will be physically or mentally capable of assuming the responsibility of world leadership. In no other way can we prevent wholesale starvation, anarchy, the rise of terrorism and dictatorships. It is the only way we can assure permanent peace and progress in tomorrow's international world.

Our Changing Attitudes

Once the world's wounds of war begin to heal, we may expect to see a great change in the attitudes among nations. They will lose their international provincialism, just as we lost ours domestically.

The change that began in the United States in the twenties, when the automobile era, symbol of the machine age, rolled in with an all-pervading rush, caused something to happen to the thinking Americans. Our mental horizons lifted from the boundaries of our own communities and began to extend over the rest of the nation. The swift development of communications, of telephone systems and radio networks, further speeded the psychological process. We started thinking in national as well as community terms. We began to perceive that the welfare of one section of the country was inextricably linked with the welfare of other sections. We saw the nation as an economic unit.

Now, extend this same machine-age principle of transportation and communications to an international scale. The war has served to accelerate enormously the development of the airplane. Huge cargo and passenger planes will span oceans at 300 and more miles per hour. International

radio networks are already a reality, and South Americans listen daily to American programs, broadcast in Spanish and English. Our fleet of modern merchant ships will soon exist in vast numbers. London, today, is much closer to Chicago than Chicago was to New York at the beginning of the century.

A more rapid, a freer international exchange of goods, knowledge, and services is an inevitable concomitant of the machine age. Although differences in languages and customs will continue to act as barriers, the mutual interests of nations will largely reconcile these differences. Understanding and tolerance will ripen in a world where nations are neighbors.

The Endless Opportunity

The international task before America is almost infinite. Cooperation with South America in the industrialization of that vast and rich continent will provide employment and opportunity for Americans for years. New markets for our factories will be created abroad. For as backward countries become industrialized our overseas trade will increase. We have always had the greatest commerce with the nations of the highest industrialization. Compare our pre-war trade with China and Africa, for instance, with that of England, Canada, Germany, and France.

Where will the money come from to build the better world of tomorrow? From the same source it has always come. Money, after all, is nothing but the symbol of wealth, and wealth is derived from hard work, from production of goods, from services, from farms and mines and mills. So it will be a world of hard work. It will not be built with pledges or promises, but by the creative mental and physical energy of man.

Those early Americans who crossed arid plains and forded wide streams, who cleared thick forests, who suffered with intense cold and heat, hardship and danger, didn't find the going easy. And we Americans of today will find many obstacles in the path as we explore the frontiers of the future.

The immediate task of helping Europe and the rest of the world recover from its shell shock will be complicated by our own problems of post-war readjustment. We can solve those problems—and we will—but it will require wise and unselfish cooperation by all groups in our national economic life.

Management, labor, agriculture, and government must cooperate to make the American business

system operate for the benefit of the people. Under this system, Americans have built the mightiest nation on the face of this planet, in war and peace.

War has forced us to erase many animosities born of depression times. Our total strength is welded into a united and indivisible front, and we are all

dedicated to victory for the forces of freedom. The peace as well as the war remains to be won, and we must project our war-welded unity into the peace.

Thus may we explore the magnificent frontiers of the future, and build the better, freer world for which we fight.

FORMER SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS *of Nebraska points out that on the United States will fall a large share of responsibility for the peace of the world.**

One year ago at Pearl Harbor a murderous, unmerciful, and unrelenting enemy stabbed our nation in the back. For one year, with our allies, we have been defending the civilization of the world. The issue is whether the principles of human freedom and honor among men and nations shall rule the world, or whether our civilization, as it now exists, shall be blotted out and we shall become the slaves of a world dictator moved only by a lust for power and the destruction of everything that is near and dear to those who believe in human progress and in human happiness.

Hitler, the outstanding dictator of the ages, has made his people believe they are destined to rule the world and are justified in using any means at their command to bring about this result.

The leaders of Japan have taught this doctrine to their people for generations.

The same doctrine has been advocated by Mussolini.

Each has taught his people to believe that eventually they will be the conquerors of the whole world.

There is no love between Germany, Japan, and Italy. At heart these people hate each other with a relentless hatred but, at the present time, it is to the interest of each one of these would-be dictators to unite their forces in order to obliterate all governments founded upon the doctrine of equal rights and human freedom. If they could succeed in this dastardly attempt to rule the world, there would soon follow a war between these three domineering nations with their conflicting ambitions. Already the domination of Hitler has shed its power and influence over Italy to such an extent that Italy is

now withering and decaying under the heel of the German army.

The civilized world refuses to be destroyed by any such doctrine. For one year we have been fighting and suffering, and our soldiers have been dying on the battlefronts of the world.

China has been suffering from the onslaughts of a murderous foe for a much longer time and, through it all, while millions of her people have been killed, and other millions have undergone untold and unspeakable outrages at the hands of a pagan foe, she has been, and still is, upholding the banner of human liberty and battling bravely in defense of the principles which we believe to be the foundation of every righteous government.

The people of Great Britain have been suffering much longer than we. They have kept the fires of human liberty burning under conditions which are almost unbelievable.

Russia has never flinched while the dictator was robbing her country and killing her people by the thousands. The sacrifice which Russia has made stands out in the world's history as one of the greatest tributes to the cause in which we believe.

Some of our people are shocked at the sacrifices we are called upon to make. They have been unjustly criticizing our efforts in this great struggle. However, on the whole, our people are presenting a front worthy of the great patriots who, through blood and tears, laid the foundation for a free government.

Absolute Victory

The indications now are that victory is in sight for us and our allies. What of this victory? It is quite clear to me that, in this victory, there

*At Freedom House Rally, Carnegie Hall, New York, December 6, 1942.

must be no appeasement—there must be no thought of a negotiated peace. The terms of this victory must be absolute. There must be an unconditional surrender. The question as to what must be the terms of the peace following such a surrender is as great in importance as the war itself. What good will come to humanity if we win the war and lose the peace? What doth it profit a man if he win the whole world and lose his own soul? Two things are necessary and essential in the peace treaty. First, it must bring a peace which shall be permanent and, second, this peace must be just and fair between us and our enemies. When I say us, I include our noble and valiant allies.

How can such a peace be obtained? To my mind the most important and essential factor in the peace must be the complete disarmament of our foes. Every submarine and armored ship must be sunk to the bottom of the sea. Every factory making war materials must be absolutely and completely demolished. Every soldier must be disarmed. Even a police force necessary to maintain the peace must be supervised in order that it may not become a part of a military preparation of rearmament. No military training or preparation for war, however small, should be permitted. The treaty must provide that this disarmament shall be permanent. Having completely disarmed our enemies, and having provided that disarmament shall be permanent, we must then, with this qualification, treat our conquered enemies in a spirit of friendliness and equality.

When we approach that sacred peace table, we must cast out of our hearts all thoughts of revenge and hatred. I know this will be difficult to do because it will be said that these enemies which have been so ruthless, so deceitful, and so murderous, must be punished and that, under the rules of past wars, we would be justified in heaping humiliation and disgrace upon them for many years to come. This feeling of hatred in our hearts and revenge in our souls is perhaps natural. However, one of the sacrifices we must make in order to secure a permanent peace is that we must approach the council table with clean hands and pure hearts. We must realize that we are not making a treaty for the men who sit on the other side of the table and who have been guilty of these terrible crimes against mankind. We are not making a treaty for their benefit—we are not making a treaty for our benefit. We know that those who sit opposite

each other at the peace table will soon pass on. A treaty which takes into consideration only those who actually sign the treaty would not bring a permanent peace. We are making this peace treaty for millions and hundreds of millions of innocent people yet unborn.

Tactics of the Good Samaritan

In the initial stages of this peace, it will be necessary for small standing armies to remain in the conquered territory to see that the treaty is carried out in good faith. As the years pass by, it will be but a short time until even these small standing armies can be decreased and it will not be many years until the armies can be entirely withdrawn. Perhaps our representatives, stationed at different places in the conquered territory, vested with the power that the treaty will give them to examine industrial developments in order to see that there is no military preparation under any guise, will be sufficient. Indeed it will not be long until such a treaty will be hailed with joy by our conquered enemies. We must give them every possible assistance—we must feed the hungry and clothe the naked. We must be the Good Samaritan.

Rich and abundant fruit will come from such a course. Those people will soon realize that, while they and their forefathers were compelled to devote all their energies to the upbuilding and maintenance of military equipment, they will be able to devote their energies to temples of peace and to industrial and agricultural developments. They will soon realize that they are getting more out of life and that the chief aim of man is not to maintain military supremacy but to upbuild the avenues of all friendly commerce and peaceful intercourse among nations. It will not be many years until these conquered nations will be governed by men who have never breathed the spirit of militarism. It will become evident to them as it will to the whole world, that it is foolish, illogical, unmerciful, and unrighteous to force unwilling people to devote a lifetime of toil to building up and maintaining a military dictatorship.

Building the New World

The experience through which we have traveled and the evil which has been brought about by this war demonstrate that our nation unarmed cannot live in peace while the enemies of democracy are building up military armament to be used eventually in our destruction and in the destruction of all

the other democracies. We will have a great responsibility on our hands—greater than any we have ever had and greater than has ever been assumed by any nation or any combination of nations. We will have on our shoulders the responsibility of the peace of the world and the preventing of another world conflagration. This responsibility will be ours—we cannot shift it—we cannot avoid it.

Of course, we cannot be expected to disarm at once. We must maintain, for a time at least, a supremacy over our conquered enemies until the disarmament feature of the peace has grown into the hearts of men, has been tried in the balance, and much good has come of it. Our disarmament will take care of itself. If Germany, Japan, and

Italy are completely disarmed, and are kept disarmed, the world will be safe for peaceful rule if we ourselves keep the faith. Gradually we will find it unnecessary to continue the great military preparations we have been compelled to go through during the past few years. We will lessen our preparation and thus lighten the burden of taxation upon our people.

With the nations we have conquered hailing the peace that was forced upon them, with the hearts of all men purified in fire and flame, and all united in building a world where happiness, human joy, human liberty, and the right of every man and woman to think and speak his thoughts prevail, a new civilization will emerge and the building of a New World will have begun.

WENDELL L. WILLKIE *reports to the American people on his trip to the Middle East, Russia, and China.* His conclusions: the world has become interdependent. What concerns the people of the Far East concerns us. We must therefore join now with our Eastern as well as our Western allies in planning for a world-wide society with political and economic freedom for all nations and all men.*

Several months ago it occurred to me that perhaps I could make a contribution to the war by visiting the world's people who have a stake in it. I wanted to see them. I wanted to talk to them at their fighting fronts. I also wanted frank discussion with both leaders and people in countries which have not yet decided on their course of action.

Naturally, in time of war, it is impossible to leave this country without permission. So I applied to the President for permission to visit the Middle East, Russia, and China. I wanted to go as a private citizen, as I had gone to England when she alone was so courageously holding the free world's battle line against Hitler. The President agreed to my trip, and asked that I perform certain specific tasks for him, which I was happy to undertake.

It was clearly understood between him and me that apart from the specific matters handled for him, I should go as a free agent. I was at liberty to express my opinion while abroad and equally so when I returned. I have talked to literally hun-

dreds and hundreds of people around the world in the last 2 months. Everywhere I made it crystal clear that I was present as a free citizen of a free country, a member of a different party from the President's—in fact, the candidate who opposed him in 1940.

I traveled in a four-engine Consolidated bomber, which had been converted for transport service and which was operated and navigated with extraordinary skill by American Army officers. All my personal expenses I paid myself. If I have occasion to write articles, reporting on my journey at greater length, any proceeds will be paid at my direction to various war relief agencies that are supporting our common cause.

I make these points clear because the citizens of a democracy have the right to know them. And tonight I am reporting to you, and summarizing my conclusions, as an American, interested only in the welfare of my country and proud that I am accountable only to my fellow citizens.

If I ever had any doubts that the world has become small and completely interdependent, this trip would have dispelled them altogether. I

*In a nation-wide broadcast, October 26, 1942.

traveled a total of 31,000 miles, which sounds very far. The net impression of my trip, however, is not one of distance from other peoples, but of closeness to them.

Now the extraordinary fact is that to cover these apparently enormous distances, we were in the air a total of only 160 hours. We usually flew from 8 to 10 hours a day when we were on the move, which means that, out of the 49 days I allotted to the trip, I had about 30 days on the ground for the accomplishment of the purposes on hand.

The new world that has been opened up by modern inventions was never more vividly illustrated, I think, than on our last lap home. We left Chengtu on October 9, traveled almost a thousand miles in China, crossed the vast expanse of the Gobi Desert and the Mongolian Republic, crossed thousands of miles of Siberia, crossed the Bering Sea, the full length of Alaska and the full width of Canada, and arrived in the United States 4 days later on October 13.

Our Planning Must Be Global

I say to you: there are no distant points in the world any longer. The myriad millions of human beings of the Far East are as close to us as Los Angeles is to New York by the fastest railroad trains. I cannot escape the conviction that in the future what concerns them must concern us, almost as much as the problems of the people of California concern the people of New York.

Our thinking and planning in the future must be global.

Now this world we live in has become small not only on the map but also in the minds of men. All around the world, there are some ideas which millions and millions of men hold in common, almost as much as if they lived in the same town. One of these ideas, and one which I can report without hesitation, has tremendous significance for us in America: it is the mixture of respect and hope with which the world looks to this country.

Whether I was talking to a resident of Belém or Natal in Brazil, or one toting his burden on his head in Nigeria, or a Prime Minister or a King in Egypt, or a veiled woman in ancient Bagdad, or a Shah or a weaver of carpets in legendary Persia, now known as Iran, or a follower of Attaturk in those streets of Ankara which look so like the streets of our Middle Western cities, or to a strong-limbed, resolute factory worker in Russia, or to

Stalin himself, or the enchanting wife of the great Generalissimo of China, or a Chinese soldier at the front, or a fur-capped hunter on the edge of the trackless forests of Siberia—whether I was talking to any of these people, or to any others, I found that they all have one common bond, and that is their deep friendship for the United States.

They, each and every one, turn to the United States with a friendliness which is often akin to genuine affection. I bring back to you this clear and significant fact: that there exists in the world today a gigantic reservoir of good will toward you, the American people.

Many things have created this enormous reservoir. At the top of the list go the hospitals, schools, and colleges which Americans—many of them missionaries—have founded in the far corners of the world. Many of the new leaders of old countries—men who are today running Iraq or Turkey or China—have studied under American teachers whose only interest has been to spread knowledge. Now, in our time of crisis, we owe a great debt to these men and women who have made friends for us.

Good will has also been stored up for us, like credit in a bank account, by those Americans who have pioneered in the opening of new roads, new airways, new shipping lines. They have caused the world to think of us as people who move goods and ideas, and move them fast. They like us for this, and they respect us.

Our motion pictures have played an important role in building up this reservoir of friendliness. They are shown all over the world. People of every country can see with their own eyes what we look like, can hear our voices. From Natal to Chungking I was plied with questions about American motion-picture stars—questions asked eagerly by shop girls and those who served me coffee, and just as eagerly by the wives of Prime Ministers and Kings.

The Dread of Imperialism

There are still other reasons for our reserve of good will abroad. The people of every land, whether industrialized or not, admire the aspirations and accomplishments of American labor, which they have heard about and which they long to emulate. Also they are impressed by American business and industry. In nearly every country I went to, there is some great dam or irrigation project, some harbor or factory, which

has been built by Americans. People like our works. I found, not only because they help to make life easier and richer, but also because we have shown that American business enterprise, unlike that of most other industrial nations, does not necessarily lead to political control or imperialism.

I found this dread of imperialism everywhere. The fact that we are not associated with it in men's minds has caused people to go much further in their approval of us than I had dared to imagine. I was amazed to discover how keenly the world is aware of the fact that we do not seek—anywhere, in any region—to impose our rule upon others or to exact special privileges.

All the people of the earth know that we have no sinister designs upon them, that even when we have in the past withdrawn from international affairs into a false self-sufficiency, it was without sinister purpose. And they know that, now we are in this war, we are not fighting for profit or loot or territory or mandatory power over the lives or the governments of other people. That, I think, is the single most important reason for the existence of our reservoir of good will around the world.

Now, as I see it, the existence of this reservoir is the biggest political fact of our time. No other Western nation has such a reservoir. Ours must be used to unify the peoples of the earth in the human quest for freedom and justice. It must be maintained so that, with confidence, they may fight and work with us against the gigantic civil forces that are seeking to destroy all that we stand for, all that they hope for. The preservation of this reservoir of good will is a sacred responsibility, not alone toward the aspiring peoples of the earth, but toward our own sons who are fighting this battle on every continent. For the water in this reservoir is the clean, the invigorating water of freedom.

I bring you the assurance that this reservoir exists. I also bring you the warning that it is leaking. It is leaking dangerously. It is leaking at a thousand points. It is leaking through steadily spreading cracks and holes. These holes have not been punched in the reservoir by Hitler. They have been punched by us. All the leaks in this priceless reservoir are of our own making. For the very existence of this reservoir is built on confidence in us, in our integrity of purpose, our honesty in dealing, our ability in performance. We have made great promises. How have these promises been fulfilled?

Take the vital matter of our production of war materials. Here we are, supposedly the biggest industrial nation on earth. But the flow of war materials out of this country to some of the nations I visited is not only small in itself, but as compared to the immensity of this global war we are engaged in, it is tragically small.

This was first dramatized for me not at the end of the trip but near the start, when I saw a warehouse that was supposedly an important distribution center for American materials to be delivered by air transport. That warehouse was about the size of my house in Rushville, which has 10 rooms. But when I came to examine the goods in it, I found there were only enough to fill about 1 room of such a house. From this infinitesimal supply, materials would have to branch out into ever-smaller streams, and finally trickle into the hands of those who so desperately need them—people who sometimes do not know whether to laugh or to weep when these crates and packages arrive.

I followed some of those streams and other streams to their destinations—and I stopped talking about American production. If I were to tell you how few bombers China has received from us you simply would not believe me. If I were to tell you how far Russia feels we are from fulfilling our commitments, you would agree with me that we have little reason to boast about our performance.

There are exceptions. I have seen American planes and tanks which have been in hard and grueling action, and which stood up magnificently. I have seen the beginnings of shipping routes which will some time carry the kind of traffic the world is waiting for. I have seen something of the heroism and the skill with which Americans—pilots, sailors, engineers—are blasting the routes clear for our production when we get it ready.

We Must Do More

When will this be? That depends, I think, on how quickly we, and our leaders, can begin to think and act offensively, can begin to mobilize, not for defense but for attack. It is my reasoned judgment that we cannot win this war 40 percent mobilized. There are a great many people listening to me tonight who would like to do more if they knew what more to do. It is up to us to make our leaders give us more to do.

For I tell you that if we continue to fail to deliver to our allies what they are entitled to expect of us

or what we have promised them, our reservoir of good will will turn into one of resentment. We cannot laugh this off or shrug it away or hide it behind censorship. Five million Russians and five million Chinese have given their lives in this struggle. Each of these countries has lost as many men as we have in our entire Army. We owe them more than boasts and broken promises.

We are also punching holes in our reservoir of good will every day by failing to define clearly our war aims. Besides giving our allies in Asia and Eastern Europe something to fight with, we have got to give them assurance of what we are fighting for. The 200 million people of Russia and the 450 million people of China—people like you and me—are bewildered and anxious. They know what they are fighting for. They are not so sure of us. Many of them have read the Atlantic Charter. Rightly or wrongly, they are not satisfied. They ask: what about a Pacific Charter; what about a World Charter?

Their doubts were expressed to me in simple, unmistakable questions. "Is there to be a charter only for the millions of the Western Hemisphere?" they asked. "Is there to be no charter of freedom for the billion people of the East? Is freedom supposed to be priceless for the white man, or for the Western World, but of no account to us in the East?"

Many of them asked me the question which has become almost a symbol all through Asia: what about India? Now I did not go to India. I do not propose to discuss that tangled question tonight. But it has one aspect, in the East, which I should report to you. From Cairo on, it confronted me at every turn. The wisest man in China said to me: "When the aspiration of India for freedom was put aside to some future date, it was not Great Britain that suffered in public esteem in the Far East. It was the United States."

This wise man was not quarreling with British imperialism in India when he said this—a benevolent imperialism, if you like. He does not happen to believe in it, but he was not even talking about it. He was telling me, and through me, you, that by our silence on India we have already drawn heavily on our reservoir of good will in the East. People of the East who would like to count on us are doubtful. They cannot ascertain from our Government's wisly-washy attitude toward the problem of India what we are likely to feel at the end of the war about all the other hundreds of millions of Eastern peoples. They cannot tell from our vague and vacillating talk whether or not we

really do stand for freedom, or what we mean by freedom.

In Africa, in the Middle East, throughout the Arab world, as well as in China and the whole Far East, freedom means the orderly but scheduled abolition of the colonial system. I can assure you that this is true. I can assure you that the rule of people by other peoples is not freedom, and not what we must fight to preserve.

Please understand—I am not talking about the Commonwealth of Free Nations. I am talking about the colonial system wherever it exists, under whatever nation. We Americans are still too apt to think and speak of the British Empire. We must recognize the truth that in vast areas of the world there is no longer any British Empire but instead a proud Commonwealth of Free Nations. British colonial possessions are but remnants of empire. We must remember that throughout the Commonwealth there are men and women numbered in millions, who are working selflessly and with great skill toward reducing these remnants, extending the Commonwealth in place of the colonial system. This, it seemed to me, was what General Smuts was talking about in his recent dramatic speech before the cheering British Parliament.

There Are No Local Problems

As Americans we must also recognize that we share with these men and women of the British Commonwealth of Free Nations the responsibility of making the whole world a commonwealth of free nations. The grim, relentless progress of this war is teaching all of us that in a world forced to choose between victory and slavery, between freedom and fascism, there are no purely local problems.

India is our problem. If Japan should conquer that vast subcontinent, we will be the losers. In the same sense, the Philippines are a British problem. If we fail to deliver, by force of arms, the independence we have promised to the Filipinos, the whole Pacific world will be the loser. We must believe these simple truths, and speak them loudly and without fear. Only in this way can the peoples of the world forge, in this war, the strength and the confidence in each other which we will need to win the peace.

There will be lots of tough problems. And they will differ in different mandates, different colonies. Not all the peoples of the world are ready for freedom, or can defend it, the day after tomorrow. But today they all want some date to work toward, some guarantee that the date will be kept. For the future, they do not ask that we solve their problems

for them. They are neither so foolish nor so faint-hearted. They ask only for the chance to solve their own problems with economic as well as political cooperation. For the peoples of the world intend to be free not only for their political satisfaction but also for their economic advancement.

There are other holes that we are blindly punching in our reservoir of good will which can be more easily repaired. One of them is the half-ignorant, half-patronizing way in which we have grown accustomed to treating many of the peoples in eastern Europe and Asia.

The rulers of our allies and our potential allies are proud and intelligent men. The Shah of Iran, the Prime Minister of Iraq, the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister of Turkey, the Generalissimo of China—to mention just a few—are men who understand the world and who have important ideas about the future. They are in substantial agreement, for example, as to the necessity of abolishing imperialism, of liberating the peoples of the world, of making freedom a reality instead of just a nice word. They feel unanimously, I think, that the United States can, and must, make an enormous contribution to the new solutions. They are able and eager to work with representatives of the United States, and to begin now.

But consider our policy. We have consistently failed to send to these men representatives with authority to discuss such problems intelligently and to take realistic steps toward their solution.

One of our representatives to a great power, for example, although he has worked for more than 20 years in the country where he is stationed, has not troubled to learn the language of a proud and sensitive people to which he is accredited. On our special missions to Russia no one of Cabinet rank has been sent from this country to talk to Mr. Stalin. It was the British Prime Minister who primarily spoke for us on the last such mission. Between Cairo and Teheran live the Arab-speaking peoples, in half a dozen lands, with great traditions and great futures. Yet when I was there we had in all this area no Minister or Ambassador in residence.

We must wipe out the distinction in our minds between "first class" and "second class" allies. We must send to represent us among all our allies really distinguished men who are important enough in their own right to dare tell our President the truth.

There is one more leak in our reservoir of good will which I must report to you. It can be plugged, I believe, by resolute and aggressive action by the

people of democratic nations, and especially of the United States. This is the atrophy of intelligence which is produced by stupid, arbitrary, or undemocratic censorship.

It has been suggested much of late, for example, that private citizens, particularly those not expert in military affairs or those unconnected with government, should refrain from making suggestions about the conduct of the war—military, industrial, economic, or political. It is said that we must remain silent and allow our leaders and the experts to solve these problems unmolested.

This position threatens, I believe, to become a tight wall which will keep the truth out and lock misrepresentation and false security within. I have reported to you tonight that in many important respects we are not doing a good job; that we are on the road to winning the war, but that we run a heavy risk of spending far more in men and materials than we need to spend. This report is based on facts. Such facts should not be censored. They should be given to us all. For unless we recognize and correct them, we may lose the friendship of half our allies before the war is over and then lose the peace.

It is plain that to win this war we must make it our war, the war of all of us. In order to do this we must all know as much about it as possible, subject only to the needs of military security. A misdirected censorship will not accomplish this.

You all recall that France had a military leader by the name of Maginot. When a farsighted citizen of France occasionally suggested that perhaps conditions of modern warfare were such that fortresses built underground would not be adequate against airplanes and tanks, he was reminded that he should leave such matters to the experts.

The Whiplash of Public Opinion

The record of this war to date is not such as to inspire in us any sublime faith in the infallibility of our military and naval experts. Let's have no more of this nonsense. Military experts, as well as our leaders, must be constantly exposed to democracy's greatest driving power—the whiplash of public opinion, developed from honest, free discussion. Men with great power usually like to live free of criticism. But when they get that way, that's the time to increase the criticism.

For instance, it was public criticism of the constant failures in North Africa that brought about a change of command there. When I was in Egypt, that new command stopped Rommel. It has now begun aggressive fighting. I hope our

aid to this action will be adequate and prompt, so that Britain and America will be able to eliminate Rommel, free North Africa from Axis domination, and begin an assault on the soft spots of southern Europe. I reiterate: we and our allies must establish a second fighting front in Europe. I also hope that shortly we can put the considerable force in India to aggressive use in an all-out attack on Burma, as General Wavell has urged. Thus we will relieve the pressure of our enemies on China and Russia, our superb fighting allies.

I have tried to outline to you the major conclusions of a trip around the world, in the middle of the war. I have told you of our greatest asset, our reservoir of good will, and I have told you of the holes we have punched in that reservoir. I have told you of certain real accomplishments and I have also told you that in many respects we are not doing a good job. You may well ask—what does it all add up to? I will try to state it briefly.

I believe that in a military sense we can win this war. I believe we have the resources, the manpower, and the courage to do so. But a military victory, as such, will not be enough.

Now I have a son in the service, as so many of you have. And when I set this boy of mine against the background of what I have seen all over the world, I am absolutely positive that a military victory will not be enough. The total defeat of the Japanese war lords, the total crushing of the German Wehrmacht, could not in themselves solve the problems of this great tumultuous earth. We must fight our way through, not alone to the destruction of our enemies but to a new world idea. We must win the peace.

To win that peace three things seem to me necessary—first, we must plan now for peace on a global basis; second, the world must be free, economically and politically, for nations and for men that peace may exist in it; third, America must play an active constructive part in freeing it and keeping its peace.

When I say that peace must be planned on a global basis, I mean quite literally that it must embrace the earth. Continents and oceans are plainly only parts of a whole, seen, as I have just seen them, from the air. Russia and China, Egypt, Syria and Turkey, Iraq and Iran are also parts. And it is inescapable that there can be no peace for any part of the world unless the foundations of peace are made secure throughout all parts of the world.

When I say that in order to have peace this world must be free, I am only reporting that a great process has started which no man—certainly not Hitler—can stop. Men and women all over the world are on the march—physically, intellectually, and spiritually. After centuries of ignorance and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent. They are resolved, as we must be, that there is no more place for imperialism within their own society than in the society of nations. The big house on the hill surrounded by mud huts has lost its awesome charm.

The Western World on Trial

Our Western World and our presumed supremacy are now on trial. Our boasting and our big talk leave Asia cold. Men and women in Russia and China and in the Middle East are conscious now of their own potential strength. They are coming to know that many of the decisions about the future of the world lie in their hands. And they intend that these decisions shall leave the peoples of each nation free from foreign domination—free for economic, social, and spiritual growth.

Finally, when I say that this world demands the full participation of a self-confident America, I am only passing on an invitation that these peoples of the East have given us. They would like the United States to be one of their partners in this grand adventure. They want us to join them in creating a new society, global in scope, free alike of the economic injustices of the West and the political malpractices of the East. But as a partner in that great new combination they want us neither hesitant, incompetent, nor afraid. They want a partner who will not hesitate to speak out for the correction of injustice anywhere in the world.

Our allies in the East know that we intend to pour out our resources in this war. But they expect us now—not after the war—to use the enormous power of our giving to promote liberty and justice. Other peoples, not yet fighting, are waiting no less eagerly for us to accept the most challenging opportunity of all history—the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the globe around can live and grow invigorated by freedom.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.
—
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300

This is a publication about the war. When
you have finished reading it, please pass it on
to a neighbor or a friend for further circulation